



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,247	02/18/2004	Chou San Nelson Loke	ASMJP.145AUS	3140
29995 7590 12/26/2008 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614				
EXAMINER				
CHEN, KEATH T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1792				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/26/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/781,247

Applicant(s)

LOKE ET AL.

Examiner

KEATH T. CHEN

Art Unit

1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 23-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 23-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The claim amendment filed on 11/18/2008, addressing claims 1-8 and 23-29 rejection from the non-final office action (07/29/2008) by amending claims 1 and 6 9-22 is entered, and will be addressed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-8 and 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation of "at a position ... closer to the showerhead than to the susceptor". There is lack of support of this limitation in the specification. Note the figure is not described as to scale.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "a controller is programmed to activate ..." There is lack of support of this limitation in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35 U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1, 6, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox et al. (US 6418874, hereafter '874), in view of Otsubo et al. (US 4776918, hereafter '918) and Herchen (US 6502529, hereafter '529).

'874 teaches some limitations of claim 1:

A thin-film deposition system (Fig. 1, #10) comprising: an evacuable (by pump #82, col. 5, line 36) plasma CVD reactor (region enclosed by bottom plate #60 and side wall #14) comprising a susceptor (substrate support member #72, col. 5, line 18) and a showerhead (a gas delivery ring with a series of nozzles at the chamber top, col. 6, lines 35-38); an RF power generator (bias generator #86, col. 6, line 13) arranged outside the plasma CVD for forming plasma discharge (bias generator #86 is capable of forming/assisting in forming plasma discharge by adjusting power) between the susceptor and showerhead (plasma is between susceptor and showerhead, col. 3, lines 56-58); a remote plasma chamber (reactor cavity #108, col. 6, lines 49-50) arranged outside the plasma CVD reactor (#104, col. 6, lines 44-46), for providing active species to an interior of the plasma CVD reactor (col. 6, lines 46-52); and an electromagnetic wave generator (#28, toroidal plasma source) arranged outside the plasma CVD reactor (above #60), the RF power generator (#86), and the remote plasma chamber, for emitting electromagnetic waves to the interior of the reactor (toroidal plasma source is to provide energy to the interior of the reactor) for cleaning an inner surface of the reactor and the showerhead (col. 2, lines 30-32; chamber interior including showerhead surfaces).

Applicant's claim requirement "for cleaning an inner surface of the reactor" is considered intended use in the pending apparatus claims. Further, it has been held that claim language that simply specifies an intended use or field of use for the invention generally will not limit the scope of a claim (Walter, 618 F.2d at 769, 205 USPQ at 409; MPEP 2106). Additionally, in apparatus claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim (In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963); MPEP2111.02).

'874 does not teaches the other limitation of:

Claim 1: (a susceptor and a showerhead) which are lower and upper electrodes capacitively coupled for forming plasma discharge therebetween; said electromagnetic wave generator being connected to a side wall of the reactor at a position between the showerhead and the susceptor and closer to the showerhead than to the susceptor.

'918 is an analogous art in the field of fabrication of semiconductor devices using low temperature plasma (field of the invention; similar to '874, col. 1, lines 5-9), particularly in high density uniform plasma (col. 2, lines 58-62; similar to '874, col. 2, lines 20-23). '918 teaches (see Fig. 11) a capacitively coupler electrodes between susceptor (electrode/table #7, col. 9, line 32) and showerhead (gas supply tube #9' and the slit plate 5', together, is a showerhead, col. 9, lines 26-31; see also col. 3, lines 47-

50) along with microwave power (Fig. 11, magnetron #3 and waveguide #2, col. 4, line 49).

'529 is an analogous art in the field of semiconductor wafer processing using plasma (col. 3, line 52), particularly in efficiently coupling electromagnetic energy to energize a gas for processing a substrate (col. 1, lines 50-51). '529 teaches electromagnetic energy source (#150, Fig. 1, col. 4, lines 21-27, including microwave, col. 3, line 59) to the side wall of the reactor at a position between the showerhead (gas distributor #85, col. 3, line 58) and the susceptor (support #70, col. 3, line 54) and closer to the showerhead (#85) than to the susceptor (#70).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have combined '918 with '874. Specifically, to have replaced the toroidal source #28 in Fig. 1 of '874 with a slit plate with gas supply as taught by '918 for the purpose/motivation of high density uniform plasma (col. 3, lines 52-53). Additionally, to have arranged the microwave electromagnetic energy source to the side wall closer to the showerhead, as taught by '529 (Fig. 1), to the apparatus in Fig. 1 of '874, for the purpose/motivation of limiting heating of the gas energizing components, as taught by '529 (col. Lines 52-53).

'874 further teaches the limitation of:

Claim 6: The system according to Claim 1, further comprising a controller (#44, col. 4, line 11) which is programmed to activates the electromagnetic wave generator

(#28, through connection of RF generator #20 and leads 24, 26 to ferrite core #22A, col. 10, lines 29-31) only for reactor cleaning (col. 2, lines 26-28, controller is capable of being set to activate #28 only for reactor cleaning because the timing and the level of RF power is controlled, col. 7, lines 5-7) and which activates the electromagnetic wave generator only for reactor cleaning (remote plasma cleaning system #104, col. 6, lines 44-52) is for cleaning only, it would have been obvious to program the controller to the electromagnetic wave generator for cleaning purpose only, to the re-arranged electromagnetic wave generator re-arranged by '529).

Claim 26: The system according to claim 1, wherein the electromagnetic waves have power (3-5 kW, col. 5, lines 55-56) effective to facilitate the cleaning of the inner surface of the reactor.

Applicant's claim requirement "to facilitate the cleaning of the inner surface of the reactor" is considered intended use in the pending apparatus claims. Further, it has been held that claim language that simply specifies an intended use or field of use for the invention generally will not limit the scope of a claim (Walter, 618 F.2d at 769, 205 USPQ at 409; MPEP 2106). Additionally, in apparatus claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim (In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963); MPEP2111.02).

Claim 27: The system according to claim 26, wherein the electromagnetic waves have power in the range of 100-5,000 W (3-5 kW, col. 5, lines 55-56).

4. Claims 2-4, 7-8, 23, and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '874, '918, and '529, further in view of Kabansky (US 20020179248, hereafter '248).

'874, '918, and '529, together, teach all limitations of claim 1, as discussed above. '874 further teaches the RF frequency for the generator #20 at 200 MHz (0.2 GHz) and connected from the top of the chamber. '874 criticizes the erosion of dome by the coil affecting the through-put of the plasma system (col. 2, lines 1-19).

'874, '918, and '529, together, do not explicitly teach the limitations of:

Claim 2: The system according to claim 1, wherein the electromagnetic waves are microwaves.

Claim 3: The system according to claim 1, wherein the reactor and the electromagnetic wave generator are connected by a waveguide.

Claim 4: The system according to claim 1, wherein the reactor comprises a sapphire window where the waveguide is connected.

Claim 7: The system according to claim 1, wherein the electromagnetic wave generator is connected to a side wall of the reactor in a direction perpendicular to an axis of the susceptor and the showerhead.

Claim 23: The system according to claim 2, wherein the microwaves have a wave length effective to facilitate cleaning of the inner surface of the reactor.

Applicant's claim requirement "to facilitate cleaning of the inner surface of the reactor" is considered intended use in the pending apparatus claims. Further, it has

been held that claim language that simply specifies an intended use or field of use for the invention generally will not limit the scope of a claim (Walter, 618 F.2d at 769, 205 USPQ at 409; MPEP 2106). Additionally, in apparatus claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim (In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963); MPEP2111.02).

Claim 28: The system according to claim 7, wherein the reactor and the electromagnetic wave generator are connected by a waveguide.

Claim 29: The system according to Claim 28, wherein the reactor comprises a sapphire window where the waveguide is connected.

'248 is an analogous art in the field of semiconductor wafer processing including cleaning (abstract, '874, col. 2, lines 30-32), particularly in reducing particles ([0014], '874, col. 2, line 16) and a dual power (Fig. 2, microwave #142 and RF #174; '874, toroidal plasma #28 and RF bias #86) apparatus for simultaneous application to the wafer ('248, abstract). '248 provides a microwave power and gas delivery set up that increases the lifetime of the hardware ([0014]), a feature that '874 desired. '248 provides a microwave generator (#142) connected to a wide wall (#160, see [0038]) through a waveguide (#144, [0027]) and the outlet (#152, [0028]) of sapphire ([0041]) plasma tube (#146, [0028]) to facilitate the dual power application to the wafer.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have combined '248 with '874, '918, and '529. Specifically, to have replaced the toroidal source #28 in Fig. 1 of '874 with a microwave plasma system as taught by '248 for its suitability for the dual power application. Note that the sapphire tube (#146) is a sapphire window (transparent) that connected to the waveguide (#144). For claim 23, any microwave wave length is considered effective wave length.

Motivation to combine would have been the suitability use the plasma power source. The selection of something based on its known suitability for its intended use has been held to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945).

'874 further teaches the remote plasma system is a microwave plasma, but is silent whether it is capacitive or inductive.

'874 does not explicitly teaches the limitation of:

Claim 8: The system according to claim 1, wherein the remote plasma generates an inductively-coupled plasma.

'248 teaches the remote plasma can be an inductively coupled plasma or a microwave plasma ([0005]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have combined adopted an inductively coupled remote plasma, as taught by '248, in the apparatus in Fig. 1 of '874 for its suitability.

The selection of something based on its known suitability for its intended use has been held to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945).

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '874, '918, and '529, further in view of '248 and Houchin et al. (US 5202095, hereafter '095).

'874, '918, and '529, together, teaches limitations of claim 1, as discussed above. '874, '918, '529, and '248, together, teach replacing toroidal source with a microwave system, as discussed above.

'874, '918, '529, and '248, together, do not teach the limitation of claim 5:

The reactor and the electromagnetic wave generator are connected by a co-axial cable.

'095 is an analogous art in the field of semiconductor plasma etching (field of invention), particularly in solving the problem of processing uniformity (col. 1, lines 43-50, '874, col. 2, lines 42-46). '095 teaches the use of coaxial cables being more advantageous over the use of waveguides for the purpose of miniaturization (col. 2, lines 20-22).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have combined '095 with '874, '918, '529, and '248. Specifically, to have replaced the waveguide (#144) in the microwave system in the apparatus in Fig. 2 of '248 with coaxial cable (and then combined with Fig. 1 of '874), for the purpose of miniaturization. Note that the replacement with cable would not be a problem to the gas hole for the plasma into outlet #152.

6. Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '874, '918, '529, and '248, further in view of Yanase (US 20020117473, hereafter '473).

'874, '918, '529, and '248, together, teach all limitations of claim 23, as discussed above. '248 is silent on the wave length and frequency of the microwave.

'874, '918, '529, and '248, together, do not explicitly teach the limitations of:

Claim 24: The system according to claim 23, wherein the microwaves have a wave length of 3×10^{-4} to 3×10^{-1} m or a frequency of 1 to 1000 GHz.

Claim 25: The system according to claim 24, wherein the microwaves have ultrahigh frequencies of 0.3-3 GHz.

'473 is an analogous art in the field of cleaning plasma etching apparatus (field of invention), particularly in solving the problem quartz etching during microwave introduction containing fluorine ([0011]), the same problem '248 is solving ([0014]). '473 teaches microwave frequency of 2.45 GHz ([0049], lines 10-11).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have combined '473 with '874, '918, '529, and '248. Specifically, to have adopted microwave frequency of 2.45 GHz in the MW power generator (#142) in Fig. 2 of '248 (and then combined with '874) for its suitability.

The selection of something based on its known suitability for its intended use has been held to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 11/18/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the new limitation added to claims 1-8 and 23-29 have been considered but are unconvincing in view of the new grounds of rejection above.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEATH T. CHEN whose telephone number is (571)270-1870. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30AM-3 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Cleveland can be reached on 571-272-1418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/K. T. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 1792

/Michael Cleveland/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792